ipso. independent press standards organisation

Clause 12 (Discrimination) Analysis 1 October to 31 December 2019

IPSO will publish information on a quarterly basis where we have received more than ten complaints under Clause 12 of the Editors' Code of Practice about the same issue. The information below gives a brief summary of the types of complaints received and the outcome. It is not intended to be exhaustive and the statistics about the numbers of complaints received are accurate up to the end of the relevant quarter. These statistics do not include any cases still under investigation; cases relating to any non-regulated publications; or cases where IPSO received fewer than 10 complaints.

Headline	Publications	Characteristics/group	Analysis
Over 100 complaints			
Pupils lose out as £400m schools funding diverted to special needs	The Times	Children with special educational needs and disabilities (SEND)	Article reporting that schools funding has been diverted from mainstream education budgets to pay for special needs education. Complainants felt the article was blaming SEND children for funding deficits in schools, and incited hatred towards vulnerable people. No complaint of discrimination against an individual.
Between 10 and 100 complaints received			
TERFs and what everyone needs to know about 'trans exclusionary radical feminists'	Cosmopolitan	Women	Article explaining what the term "TERF" means. Article is critical of women who do not consider transwomen to be women. Complainants said that "TERF" was a sexist slur and considered hate speech by some organisations. Some complainants said that the article was seeking to legitimise violent rhetoric which has been used against lesbians and women, and that the article was misogynistic and homophobic. No complaint of discrimination against an individual.

Headline	Publications	Characteristics/group	Analysis
If you do one thing this election, stop your kids voting	The Spectator	Muslims	Comment piece which suggested holding the forthcoming election on a day when Muslims would be unable to vote, which would mean at least 40 seats would go to the Conservatives. Complainants said that the article was racist and proposed voter suppression of Muslims. Other complainants said the article implied that Muslims vote a particular way and was mocking, belittling and divisive. No complaint of discrimination against an individual.